

U.S. cities came for the first time to the capital of Idaho, Boise. A police officer was killed in the line of duty—the first officer ever killed during the 100 years of operation for the Boise Police Department. The incident resulted from an altercation between two suspects, who were also killed in the confrontation with officers. Mark Stall was killed on early Saturday morning when he and another officer pulled over a vehicle for a traffic violation. The result was a shoot-out between two suspects and police officer. Another officer, Ron Winegar, was injured during the confrontation and remains hospitalized.

Officer Stall was a remarkable young man, one driven to a career in law enforcement from a dangerous encounter during his teenage years, when he and another young man were abducted and threatened at gunpoint. Boise benefited tremendously through his 3 years of service on the Boise Police Force. He leaves behind a wife and two young daughters and a community attempting to cope with a traumatic loss of one of those entrusted to protect and serve.

On Wednesday, businesses in Boise closed and flags flew at half-staff as Boise police, for the first time, buried one of their own. A newspaper columnist in Boise declared that Boise lost "its innocence with the death" of Officer Stall. That may be true—it is a tragic circumstance, one that has been repeated far too often throughout our country. We should all reflect on the loss experienced by those in Boise and how our communities can once again become safe havens for our families.

A TRIBUTE TO JESSICA KOZLOV

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 30, 1997

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, recently a friend, a proud father, sent me an article his daughter authored. It seems to me that Jessica Kozlov, editor of Duke University's, the Chronicle, clearly articulates important and deep thoughts that are part of her developing being. I'd like to share them for the record.

[From the Chronicle, Sept. 16, 1997]

HOUSEWIVES PLACE IN SOCIETY MINIMIZED BY FEMINIST MOVEMENT (By Jessica Kozlov)

June Cleaver is as anachronistic in the '90s as Peg Bundy would have been in the '50s.

It is because feminism has begun to dictate those accomplishments of a woman that can be deemed "merit-worthy"—and June Cleaver no longer fits that model? Or is it because women have become so obsessively wrapped up in breaking the glass ceiling that they have forgotten she ever existed?

In a society that encourages women to be men in the workplace and mere nannies in the home, the triumphs and rewards of being a "house mom" have been overshadowed by the honor of being the division president of a company or by the esteem earned from climbing the corporate ladder. I am an anachronism in my own society, but only because of my mother: She was June Cleaver, and the only one in my neighborhood.

My family could be considered an atypical nuclear family: two parents, two children and a German shepherd named Abigail. All under one roof.

Dad went to work every day. Mom stayed home, packed our lunch and waited for the

school nurse to call with an update of my newest illness. She was always there to retrieve me, teary eyed, from the school office—and because of that, I am different.

I came from a town where au pairs were the norm and housewifery a foreign concept. I remember afternoons at my friends' homes, eating after-school snacks served by babysitters who didn't speak English and cared only about their boyfriends back home in Italy or France.

My mother put her career on hiatus when I was born—a 21-year hiatus, and counting. The most important thing to her was raising her children, and for her, it was a full-time job. The result: My friends wanted to be career women when they grew up, and I just wanted to be Miss Piggy.

But 21 years have passed since my mom made that decision, and society is different. My mother was a product of the June Cleaver era, but my generation is the product of an era that began with "Working Girl" and has yet to peak.

Our society no longer admires the woman who chooses her family over her career. Feminism's quest to shatter the glass ceiling began as a valiant, admirable effort—and it has almost achieved its tangible goal. But in its path it has left a track of shattered values, misdirected esteem and latch-key children. The feminist movement has taken great strides in the past few decades: An increasing number of women are playing major roles in today's corporate world, and we are rapidly achieving a "genderless" workplace. Women themselves have completed a 180-degree rotation from the homemaker to the working girl. That which we respect and strive for as women—and as society as a whole—has also completed that rotation.

In changing the perspective from which we define our values, we have changed our accomplishments to parallel those values. In other words, because a powerful movement valued gender equality in the workplace, women strive to achieve that equality.

Undermining the importance of gender equality is not my intention. Indeed, women have come a long way and should strive to maintain the gain already earned. But we must not lose sight of—or minimize—the reward we once experienced, be it personal or external, from raising our own children. The success that accompanies raising a child—in the eyes of many members of society—is no longer equivalent to the success that accompanies climbing the corporate ladder.

Now here we are at the third-ranked school in the nation, attending class after class. And for the first time, maybe learning just how much we don't know. We are here because we strive for the best—to be the best and to do the best. And we are immersed in an environment that fosters those intentions.

As I sit here in The Chronicle office enjoying the end of one of my many 18-hour days, I realize I have the genes of the quintessential workaholic.

Not long from now I will once again ask myself what I want to be when I grow up—and the answer will be much more difficult than it was in the days when Miss Piggy was my hero. A career is certainly a priority, and it is to that end that I have been trained to think.

Logically, I know I would appreciate the opportunity to stay home with my children—to raise children who will have the benefit of a childhood experience similar to mine and to promote their ability to grow up and contribute to the wealth of knowledge and the pool of successful individuals; to put down the reins of this parade of all-nighters and end the days endured on pure adrenaline highs.

I hope in today's society, in which the working woman is valued over the home-

maker, I'll have the courage to follow my values as I have defined them and not follow what society has proscribed for me, just as my mother would have done.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT: THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

HON. DANA ROHRBACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 30, 1997

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday evening, my colleague from California, Mr. MILLER, resumed his nonstop, politically driven attack on the government and people of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. The gentleman's remarks and accusations, along with those of Mrs. MINK and Ms. DELAUNO are simply untrue and need to be corrected and clarified.

I respect and agree with their position that more Federal resources and efforts need to be directed to the Northern Mariana Islands to enforce the laws of which the Federal Government has jurisdiction. However, I believe their unwarranted attacks on the CNMI were misdirected, especially upon examination of the Federal law enforcement presence on the islands. In addition, I do not agree with their solution to increase the Federal law enforcement presence in the CNMI. When one takes into consideration that there are only two assistant U.S. attorneys on the islands—not to mention the fact that there is no U.S. attorney stationed on the islands—using American taxpayer dollars to increase funding for the Federal Victims' Assistance Program, as Mr. MILLER and Mrs. MINK proposed, is bad public policy.

The Northern Mariana Islands, with very few exceptions, is governed by the laws of the United States of America. Both the U.S. citizens on the islands and the guest worker population reside under the protection of the U.S. flag and its Federal laws. For these reasons, the people of the Northern Mariana Islands willingly entered into a unique covenant with the United States in 1976. The people overwhelmingly voted to accept their self-government status, along with the responsibilities of being part of the American family. I am here to tell you that the CNMI Government and its people are living up to their responsibilities—they have established a self-reliant economy enabling the local government to fund its own operations without the assistance of Federal dollars through free enterprise; enforcement of local labor and immigration laws in the last 5 years has improved significantly and are continuing to be addressed stringently today; and the CNMI is promoting democratic values in Southeast Asia, where the American way of doing things is beginning to become the norm.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government is not fully living up to their Federal law enforcement responsibilities in the Northern Mariana Islands. The CNMI does not have authority to enforce U.S. laws. Enforcement of U.S. laws in the Commonwealth is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government. It is disingenuous for my colleagues to assert that the CNMI Government is not enforcing its local labor laws when the vast majority of alleged violations—nearly 90 percent—of labor laws in the